UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/594,130	06/27/2007	Seiichi Toki	59150-8038	7080
22918 PERKINS COI	7590 12/16/200 E LLP	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1208	}	WORLEY, CATHY KINGDON		
SEATTLE, WA	X 98111-1208		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1638	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/594,130	TOKI, SEIICHI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
CATHY K. WORLEY	1638		

	CATHY K. WORLEY	1638				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
NOTE: The propsed amendments appear to limit to			nev continue to			
recite "monocotyledon" which is a more broad gen 112; therefore, the proposed amendments have no submitted, it would not cause problems under 35 L 103: A method for transforming rice, comprising	us of plants, and this inconsistency of been entered. The Applicant is a USC 112, and it would overcome the	will raise new issues dvised that if the follo e previous rejection ur	under 35 USC wing claim were nder 35 USC			
Agrobacterium which contains a desired recombinate culture with a medium containing the growth factor	ant gene, wherein the seed is germ 2,4-D for 1 day after sowing (<u>inated by being subje</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 ar	<u>cted to pre-</u> nd 41.33(a)).			
4. $oxedsymbol{oxed}$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving. 		I be entered and an ex	xplanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is	necessary and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	Adam NOT where the array of the	andition for U	b			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce pecause:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					

Application No.

/Cathy K. Worley/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 916

Continuation of 13. Other: The propsed amendment filed on Dec. 7, 2008, was submitted by Susan Meyers Fitch of King & Spalding LLP; however the attorney of record is any attorney associated with Customer No. 22918 which is Perkins Cole LLP (see Oath submitted on Spet. 25, 2006). The Examiner called Susan Meyers Fitch and asked if a change in power of attorney had been submitted. She indicated that a change in power of attorney had not been submitted and asked if a declaration under CFR 1.34 would serve as a substitute. The Examiner consulted with a quality specialist (QAS) and was informed that a declaration under CFR 1.34 would not be sufficient to discuss any particulars of the case or to negotiate Examiner's amendments. Because the Examiner can not discuss the case and negotiate Examiner's Amendments, this advisory action is being sent. It will be sent to the attorney of record, Perkins Cole LLP. The Applicant is advised that if they truly intend to utilize King & Spalding LLP to prosecute this application then they MUST SUBMIT A CHANGE IN POWER OF ATTORNEY. If, however, they intend to continue to utilize Perkins Cole LLP, then they should direct Perkins Cole LLP to submit a response to the final rejection mailed on Oct. 6, 2008.